



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Sanctuary System
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary
175 Edward Foster Rd.
Scituate, MA 02055
(781) 545-8026 FAX: (781) 545-8036

15 SAC MINUTES

15th SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
The Boston Museum of Science, Boston, MA
9 June 2005

MINUTES OF MEETING

PRESENT

Bill Adler	Member: Fixed Gear Commercial Fishing
Regina Asmutis-Silvia	(Alternate to Susan Farady—Conservation)
Peter Auster	Member: Research
Edward Barrett	Member: Mobile Gear Commercial Fishing
Priscilla Brooks	Member: Conservation
Dale Brown	(Alternate to Sally Yozell—At-Large)
Deborah Cramer	Member: At-Large
Susan Farady	Member: Conservation
Barry Gibson	Member: Recreation
Porter Hoagland	(Alternate to Mason Weinrich—Research)
Paul Howard	(Ex-Officio Member)
Ray Lennon	(Designee to Kathleen Dolan) (Ex-Officio Member)
Martin McCabe	(Alternate to William Eldridge—Marine Transportation)
Steve Milliken	Member: Whale Watching
LT Paul Murphy	(Designee for RADM David Pekoske) (Ex-Officio Member)
Judith Pederson	(Alternate to Peter Auster—Research)
David Pierce	(Designee for Paul Diodati) (Ex-Officio Member)
Kathi Rodrigues	(Designee for Patricia Kurkul) (Ex-Officio Member)
Susan Snow-Cotter	(Ex-Officio Member)
Steven Tucker	(Alternate to Deborah Cramer—At-Large)
Dick Wheeler	Member: Education (Ex-Officio Member)
John Williamson	Member: At-Large

SBNMS and NATIONAL PROGRAM STAFF

Craig MacDonald, Superintendent	Ben Cowie-Haskell	Nathalie Ward
---------------------------------	-------------------	---------------

OTHERS PRESENT

Timothy Feehan, Perot Systems	Nick Rofo, Perot Systems	Helene Scalliet
Brian Hopper	David Bergeron	David Slocum
Kate Smuckler	John Tulik	Jay Vogt, Peoplesworth



I. Welcome, Review of Agenda and Approval of 14th SAC Minutes (John Williamson)

Welcome and Recognition

John Williamson opened the meeting and welcomed all members to the 15th Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary (SBNMS) Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. Special thanks were given to all members for their attendance and for their dedication to the process. All in attendance were advised that this meeting was being recorded.

Williamson introduced some of the SAC Alternates that were present at the table:

- Martin McCabe, Alternate to William Eldridge—Marine Transportation
- Ray Lennon, Designee to Kathleen Dolan—Ex-Officio Member
- Porter Hoagland, Alternate to Mason Weinrich—Research

Review of Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and accepted by the SAC with one change—move the LNG Update to the afternoon session.

Approval of 14th SAC Minutes

The following are revisions to the 14th SAC Minutes, as requested by SAC members:

- Peter Auster requested that the last sentence of the last bullet point on page 3 be changed to reflect the fact that the letter in question was not edited and the SAC voted on it as is. He also requested that the second sentence under Discussion, page 5, be changed to read:

"For example, "Is there information or data that can be retrieved from other agencies to assist in investigation?"

MOTION to accept the minutes of the 14th SAC Meeting were accepted as amended.

II. Sanctuary Report (Craig MacDonald)

Sanctuary Report

Craig MacDonald provided a brief report on the sanctuary. First, MacDonald recognized the participation of Ben Cowie-Haskell in a Muscular Dystrophy fundraiser Scituate, MA. MacDonald then described damage to the SBNMS Boathouse dock from two Nor' Easters that struck the area during the winter of 2005. Each storm resulted in the grounding of a sailboat at the SBNMS dock. One in particular, a thirty foot boat, caused extensive damage to a pylon and planking of the dock. The sanctuary is currently seeking remediation for damages done. Damages have impacted the SBNMS budget. Some damage was caused to the SBNMS research vessel. The sanctuary has also recently recovered from a second story water leak in the sanctuary office building.

Management Plan Review (MPR) Update

MacDonald stated that the MPR process is still underway. The MPR is currently still on schedule for a Fall 2005 release.

Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Update

MacDonald provided a brief update on the proposals for the EXCELERATE and Neptune LNG offshore unloading facilities. Proposed routing measures to change vessel traffic lanes are being opposed. The LNG companies are in opposition to such a proposal as it will reduce their ability to identify alternate sites. Sanctuary staff was hopeful that a U.S. Coast Guard report concerning the Neptune proposal could be released to the SAC; however, permission was denied.

III. Constituent Reports

Cape Cod Maritime Days (Steven Tucker)

Steven Tucker provided a report on the Cape Cod Maritime Days festival, which is usually held during the third week of May each year. The focus of the festival is to broaden the understanding of the maritime history of Cape Cod communities. A maritime history symposium and harbor festival in Hyannis provided the venue. This festival started small, but has grown; 2005 was the thirteenth year, consisting of over fifty events during the festival.

This year, the SBNMS was brought into the event. A screening of "The Wreck of the Portland" was shown in the screening room at the Cape Cod Museum of Art. This screening served to bring the sanctuary and the art community together, which is a relationship that both the Cape Cod Museum of Art, and the SBNMS hope to expand. The screening was filled to capacity and was followed by a reception at the museum's bistro. A second screening was scheduled at Woods Hole, which was also well received and attended.

Continued publicity and exposure is a positive influence for the SBNMS. Further publicity within will be helpful. MacDonald expressed that the SBNMS would like to be part of expanding the events publicity in the future, and to tie in with Gloucester as well.

Questions & Answers

Question 1: John Williamson asked if there has been any tie-in to other Federal programs?

Answer: Tucker answered that this has not been done. The Cape Cod Maritime Days festival was used specifically because of personal connections. There is an Arts and Science link in the public realm with a push to get research out to the public. The push is to get hard science into a format for public consumption. Peter Auster added that local Sea Grant offices currently do this and that Sea Grant should be contacted.

NMFS Marine Mammal Program (Brian Hopper)

Brian Hopper presented information concerning the NMFS Marine Mammal Program.

Statutory Authorities for Marine Mammal Protection

The Protected Resources Division has two main teams that overlap—Marine Mammals and Endangered Species. Each team was formed to comply with a specific Act. The two Acts are:

- Endangered Species Act (ESA)
 - enacted in 1973;
 - identifies NOAA Fisheries and USFWS as the Federal agencies responsible for implementation;
 - lists endangered and threatened species; and,
 - designates critical habitat.
- Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA)
 - enacted in 1972;
 - identifies NOAA Fisheries and USFWS as the Federal agencies responsible for implementation; and,
 - 1994 amendments to regulate interactions with commercial fisheries,

Marine Mammal Protection Act

Amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act called for the reduction in the incidental taking of marine mammals. These amendments were:

- The 1994 Amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) changed the regulations governing the incidental taking of marine mammals in the course of commercial fishing operations including:
 - Immediate goal — “...reduce, within 6 months of its implementation, incidental mortality or serious injury of marine mammals incidentally taken in commercial fishing operations to levels less than PBR;”
 - Long-Term goal — “...to reduce, within 5 years of its implementation, the incidental mortality or serious injury of marine mammals...to insignificant levels approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate; and,
 - Establishment of take reduction teams and development of take reduction plans for certain fisheries.

List of Fisheries (LOF)

Annually, NMFS publishes a LOF that places all U.S. commercial fisheries into one of three categories based on the level of incidental serious injury and mortality of marine mammals:

Category	General Descriptor	Formula
I	Frequent take	50% or more of Potential Biological Removal (PBR)
II	Occasional take	>1% to <50% of PBR
III	Remote likelihood /none documented	1% or less of PBR

PBR= max # of animals, not including natural mortality, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock while allowing the stock to reach or maintain Optimal Sustainable Population (OSP).

Category I and II fisheries must register in MMPA, must carry observers if requested, and must comply with all Take Reduction Plans.

Category I, II, and III fisheries must report interactions with marine mammals.

Regina Asmutis-Silvia added that $PBR = \frac{R_{Max}}{2} N$ where reproduction operates on a sliding scale (0.1 - 1). Not all takes are known and currently North Atlantic right whales and humpback whales are exceeding PBR.

Take Reduction Teams

As mandated by the Marine Mammal Protection Act, take reduction teams were established. The following table lists the take reduction teams and their associated fisheries:

Team	Species	Fisheries
Atlantic Large Whale	Right whale Humpback whale Fin whale	Southeastern US Atlantic shark gillnet Northeast/Mid-Atlantic lobster trap/pot, Mid Atlantic coastal gillnet, Northeast sink gillnet, Southeast Atlantic gillnet
Harbor porpoise	Harbor porpoise	Northeast sink gillnet Mid-Atlantic coastal gillnet
Bottlenose dolphins	Bottlenose dolphin	MA coastal gillnet and haul seine/beach seine, VA pound nets, NC inshore gillnet and stop net, SE Atlantic gillnet, blue crab trap/pot
Pelagic Longline	Common dolphin; Pilot whale	Atlantic Pelagic Longline
Atlantic Trawl	Common dolphin; Pilot whale	Atlantic Trawl (e.g., Squid, Mackerel, Butterfish)

Other Components of the Marine Mammal Program

- Disentanglement Network—
 - Locates and assesses entangled whales; and, removes entangling gear when it is determined to be life threatening.
 - The network includes numerous governmental and non-governmental agencies, fishermen, and other trained individuals from Maine to Florida
- Stranding Network—
 - Responds to marine mammals that have washed ashore (stranded) along the east coast of the U.S.
 - Assesses trends in marine mammal health and how these trends correlate with environmental data.
- Gear Research and Development—
 - Researches and develops gear modifications to reduce the risk of serious injury and mortality to marine mammals.
- Whale Research—
 - Whale research and conservation programs are conducted at the Northeast Fisheries Science Center in Woods Hole, MA.
- Research Funding Programs—
 - Solicit new and innovative gear modification ideas that will reduce the risk of serious injury and mortality to critically endangered right whales, and other large whales, which result from encounters with fixed gears such as trap/pot and sink gillnet gear.
- Sighting Advisory System—
 - A multi-institutional effort to locate right whales and to make mariners aware of their presence.
- Ship Strike Reduction—
 - Requires ships greater than 300 gross tons entering two key right whale habitats—one off the northeast U.S. and one off the southeast U.S.—to report to a shore-based station.

- Ships receive a message about right whales including their vulnerability to ship strikes, precautionary measures the ship can take to avoid hitting a whale, and locations of recent sightings.
- Fishery Liaisons—
 - Outreach to fishing industry on various regulations and issues related to marine mammals.
- Marine Mammal Viewing—
 - Promotes responsible and sustainable marine mammal viewing through education programs and enforcement.
- Fishery Observer Program—
 - Deploys fishery observers to collect catch and bycatch data from U.S. commercial fishing and processing vessels.

Questions & Answers

Question 1: John Williamson asked what is the current PBR is for right whales?

Answer: Hopper replied that with a total population of 350 individuals, the PBR for Right Whales is 0.

Question 2: Peter Auster asked if there are any species currently at OSP?

Answer: Hopper answered that he was not sure at the current time but he would provide this information at a later date.

Question 3: John Williamson asked if PBR operated at a specific confidence interval since fisheries operate around a 50% confidence interval?

Answer: Hopper answered that he was not sure at the current time and that he would check with Richard Pale. Peter Auster added that this would vary by species, based on a population assessment.

Question 4: John Williamson asked what a 'take' specifically was?

Answer: Hopper explained that based on the MMPA, a 'take' for marine mammals was defined as “to hunt, harass, pursue, kill, injure or attempt any of the above, or alter the behavior of a marine mammal.”

Question 5: Richard Wheeler asked if there was an organization with a specific focus on sea turtles?

Answer: Hopper answered that the take reduction plans are currently trying to cover sea turtles. The problem is that sea turtles fall under the Endangered Species Act while the take reduction teams operate under the MMPA.

Question 6: Peter Auster asked if an organization existed with a specific focus on sea birds and migratory birds?

Answer: Hopper explained that the Migratory Species Act covered migratory birds. Currently, sea birds are being reviewed on the West Coast. It is possible that sea birds could be factored into the Migratory Species Act. Kathi Rodrigues added that some sea bird mortality numbers are emerging from fisheries observer data.

Question 7: Regina Asmutis-Silvia asked that since a take reduction team meeting occurred in April, why hasn't a proposed rule come out?

Answer: Hopper explained that the current rule has been filed by NOAA Headquarters. Some Congressional delay has occurred where questions needed to be answered. The rule will be re-filed and should be published by the end of June if there is no further Congressional delay.

Question 8: Regina Asmutis-Silvia asked if any work had been done for distinguishing short- and long-finned pilot whales?

Answer: Hopper answered that it is hard to distinguish between the populations from overflight surveys. Overflight surveys are difficult and NOAA is currently trying to deal with this issue. The same issue has emerged concerning offshore and inshore bottlenose dolphin stocks.

Question 9: Deb Cramer asked what the effectiveness was of the take reduction teams, considering that it seems as though there have been a number of ‘takes.’ She added, with 28 Right Whale calves having been born, is there anything being done to protect them?

Answer: Hopper explained that a policy was currently being finalized for ship strikes. NOAA is currently looking to get alternatives for a NEPA document to make a proposed rule. However, the process is a slow one. With other programs such as the Sightings Program, there has been a great deal of effort and everyone is still trying to reduce risk to whales.

Question 10: Regina Asmutis-Silvia inquired as to whether any affects have been determined due to the current *Alexandrium* issue (red tide)? A red tide caused a die-off in 1980—has the current situation affected whale populations?

Answer: Hopper answered that NOAA was aware of the 1980 event; however, it is difficult to address or prevent impacts from a natural impact such as red tide. It is being monitored and would need follow-up by the NOAA Northeast Science Center. Craig MacDonald added that the sanctuary was aware of the situation and that it was being monitored.

Question 11: Porter Hoagland asked if a list of marine mammal research programs and amounts of money spent on each program could be provided?

Answer: Hopper answered that he did not currently have a list but one could be provided. Craig MacDonald added that there has been a close relationship between the SBNMS and the Protected Resources Division. SBNMS is currently looking to integrate programs to make this relationship truly collaborative.

Question 12: John Williamson asked if there were any success stories with the programs?

Answer: Hopper explained that for harbor porpoise, acoustic pingers have reduced takes. Also, a recent humpback entanglement was handled efficiently and the whale was successfully disentangled. The entangled gear has not been identified, but the work crew buoyed the gear to investigate later with a larger boat that could haul the gear. This was a great success story showing a cooperative effort between whale watch and other groups like the Center for Coastal Studies.

IV. SAC Business (John Williamson)

Whale Watching Member; New Recruitment/Selection Committee (MacDonald)

MacDonald introduced Steve Milliken as the new Whale Watch SAC Member. Other SAC seats that need to be filled include the member and alternate Business/Industry seat; and, the Education alternate seat. MacDonald asked SAC members to provide recommendations for the available seats. The Business/Industry seat is not intended to be a marine trades industry representative, but intended for boating sports industries or a representative from a local Chamber of Commerce. MacDonald will provide a list of specific businesses as a guide for selecting a new member.

MacDonald noted that the NMSP Headquarters has initiated a new recruitment protocol, notably that the recruitment of new SAC members requires a Selection Committee. All applications will go to the

Selection Committee for review and then forwarded to the Superintendent with specific recommendations.

Peter Auster moved to give the Executive Committee the authority to serve as the Selection Committee. **(MOTION)** Motion seconded by Barry Gibson. The motion was accepted by the SAC with the following voting results (see Appendix A for voting record):

- Yea: 11
- Nay: 0
- Abstain: 1

Basta's Letter to Councils (Williamson)

Williamson provided information regarding Dan Basta's letter to create a regional organizational structure in the NMSP. Basta suggests that the national, regional and local aspects of the system will address planning issues at the scale with which they can most effectively be dealt. This regional structure was discussed at the SAC Coordinator's and Chair's Meeting in February 2005. The Chairman's group offered feedback that expressed concern regarding the development of policy at a national level; and, that a strong, national and regional infrastructure might undermine planning at the individual sanctuary level. It was expressed by the Chairs' group that the strength of the NMSP lies in the regional and local expertise for each sanctuary. The local nature of the NMSP must be preserved.

Discussion: It was the opinion of many SAC members that the SAC should support the Chairs' group position. SAC members Peter Auster, Susan Farady, John Williamson, Craig MacDonald, Porter Hoagland and Paul Howard discussed this topic. SAC members were concerned about the possibility of adding another bureaucratic layer to the system. It was advised that the NMSP was trying to lay the groundwork to establish other sanctuaries based on other regional programs like NOAA Fisheries. It was stated that the intent of the regional structure was to coordinate efforts on problems common to all sanctuaries; and, the NMSP also needed some public group at the national organizational level to advise them. The NMSP was looking for a way to create national policy that would be applied consistently.

SAC members expressed that the interaction between such a national body and the SAC would need to be explained. It was hoped that the preferred alternative discussed at the Chairs' Meeting would ensure that policy would flow from the individual sanctuaries.

Individuals questioned how a regional structure would be funded. SAC members were concerned that a regional structure would overburden an already under-funded system. It was uncertain how a regional structure would benefit the SBNMS. Many SAC members were in support of the Chairs' group feedback. SAC members were urged to send individual comments to Dan Basta at the NMSP.

Update: Letter to Gutierrez (Williamson)

Williamson updated the SAC as to the status of the Gutierrez letter. To date, the letter had been approved by eleven of twelve sanctuaries. Signatures were currently being gathered and the letter would be delivered within the next few weeks.

Announcements

The following announcements were delivered:

- Council Corner: Regina Asmutis (MacDonald)
MacDonald reviewed the article about Regina Asmutis-Silvia in the current issue of *Sanctuary Watch*. The article was a great showcase. Regina was congratulated.

- Williamson Volunteer of the Year Nomination (MacDonald)
MacDonald updated the SAC on John Williamson's nomination for Volunteer of the Year. Nominees from each sanctuary gathered in Washington D.C. during National Oceans Week, where an awards dinner was given. The nominee from the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale Sanctuary accepted the award on behalf of all volunteers for the NMS system nationwide.
- Other Business
 - New Exhibits (MacDonald)
MacDonald expressed thanks to Peter Auster for introducing the idea to create the mosaic of benthic communities that appeared in the latest issue of *Soundings*. Special thanks were also extended to the artist that created the graphic. The sanctuary is currently looking to have this graphic made into a poster.

Also within *Soundings* is a presentation of the new SBNMS Boulder Reefs exhibit at the Boston Aquarium. The exhibit cost roughly \$500,000. The National Sanctuary Foundation provided \$75,000 for the tank and the sanctuary provided \$40-50,000.

Also, a new SBNMS exhibit will be unveiled at the Gloucester Marine Heritage Center. The schooner *Bluenose* will be visiting the Center all summer and the SBNMS exhibit is located so that visitors will walk through it on the way to view the schooner. The NMSP has contributed \$150,000 for this exhibit. A more interactive exhibit will be developed in the future.

- SAC Coordinator Training (Ward)
The SBNSM will host the SAC Coordinator Training September 19 to 23, 2005. A whale watch trip has been scheduled for the September 21, 2005.
- SBNMS Volunteer Award (Ward)
It was proposed that some recognition be developed for volunteers for the SBNMS. Some SAC members were concerned that this would interfere with the National Volunteer of the Year nomination. The idea has merit and will be refined.
- Constituent Reports (Ward)
Ward thanked the presenters of the Constituent Reports. She requested that other SAC members volunteer for future Constituent Reports. Ward also requested suggestions for luncheon speakers at future SAC meetings.
- Blue Planet (Ward)
Ward noted the recent article on the SBNMS in the Ocean Conservancy's publication *Blue Planet*. Susan Farady added that the entire issue of the publication highlighted New England waters. The SBNMS was a very good topic to include in this issue. Farady offered to provide copies to anyone who wanted them.

V. Compatibility Determination (CD) Working Group (WG) (Farady)

Chair: Susan Farady Team Lead: Ben Cowie-Haskell

The Summary Report for the CD WG was reviewed by facilitator Jay Vogt as presented in the Executive Summary of the Action Plan (AP handout to SAC). This report had no non-consensus items.

John Williamson moved to accept the recommendations of the CD WG as amended by the SAC.
(MOTION) Motion seconded by Priscilla Brooks.

Discussion: The CD Action Plan was discussed by SAC members William Adler, John Williamson, Peter Auster, Susan Farady, Porter Hoagland Kathi Rodrigues, SBNMS Superintendent Craig MacDonald and SBNMS CD Team Lead Ben Cowie-Haskell. Discussions covered the background behind the CD WG decision making, the creation of a sanctuary vision, and how the CD Action Plan would fit with other Action Plans. A letter of comment from Peter Borrelli (absent SAC member) was read into the record, adding additional points to the discussion.

SAC members acknowledged how critical developing a sanctuary vision—not just for the CD Action Plan, but the sanctuary. There was some discussion over the timing of creating a vision, and concern that public involvement would be included, if the vision was for inclusion in the current Management Plan. It was explained that the suggestion in the CD Action Plan to include a vision in the current Management Plan came about because of the need for a vision as soon as possible in order to implement the CD Action Plan. The sanctuary superintendent would create the vision based on SAC input. Public comment would be provided when the Management Plan was released for public review.

Some SAC members raised concern that the other WG Action Plans were developed in the absence of a sanctuary vision, and as such, basing a vision on current goals and objectives could become circular. The sanctuary superintendent emphasized that the vision is broader than all the Action Plans. He noted that all the WG's have reviewed public comment, and developed and prioritized AP objectives and strategies. As a result, the SAC is prepared now to develop a sanctuary vision that will work.

It was noted that the vision was vital to the CD process. The WG dealt with theoretical and abstract ideas of how to apply a portion(s) of the Sanctuary Act compared to the more concrete issues of other WGs, such as minimizing ship strikes of marine mammals. The recommendations of the CD WG are based on a number of examples of how other agencies determine compatible uses. Many of these examples the WG reviewed used a vision for a particular site or program to guide the process. However, there was no single example that could be specifically applied to the SBNMS. The resulting process suggested in the CD Action Plan is a mix of key ideas necessary for CD that can be applied in the SBNMS. The WG could only identify the major process steps to conducting a CD analysis, and was made limited progress once the discussion turned to the specifics of indicators and standards. An actual 'screening tool' would still need to be developed to make decisions on compatible uses. However, the WG was mindful of the need for research to continue to identify measurable indicators, and to provide feedback to further refine the process. The burden of proof for a CD analysis would need to have a rational basis, not vast amounts of data. The Sanctuary Compatibility Analysis Process (S-CAP) would provide a rational basis.

There was some concern from SAC members as to how the CD Action Plan and the sanctuary vision would affect the individual Action Plans. It was explained that the charge of the CD WG not to identify how a vision would affect other Action Plans. Concerning the authority of the sanctuary superintendent and stakeholders, it was clear that decision makers within the CD process would have to be identified. Public buy-in to the process was vital.

The wording of the Action Plan was specific to make it clear that the CD process would be a management tool to be used by the sanctuary. The process would be a useful compliment to other Action Plans. Missions, goals and objectives presented in other Action Plans could be used to help determine compatible uses. The tool could be used to identify compatible uses and also determine if uses continue to be compatible. At some point, a matrix or flowchart would need to be developed to be used as a screening tool.

MOTION to accept the CD AP; This motion was carried with the following voting results (see Appendix A for voting record):

- Yea: 13

- Nay: 0
- Abstain: 0

VI. Zoning (Z) WG (Williamson)

Chair: John Williamson Team Lead: Ben Cowie-Haskell

Williamson provided a brief overview of the first meeting of the Zoning WG. The WG met on 31 May 2005 in Boston. At the first meeting the WG members were introduced and they reviewed the charge of the WG. The WG identified the criteria for the Z WG Subcommittee to define 'ecological integrity'; and, identified possible membership for the subcommittee. The subcommittee will meet to define 'ecological integrity' over the course of the summer. When the subcommittee has completed its task, the Z WG will reconvene in September, 2005.

VII. Old/New Business

Sanctuary Vision

As directed by the CD Action Plan, a sanctuary vision must be created by the SBNMS Superintendent with input from the SAC. John Williamson moved to hold a special half day meeting of the SAC in July 2005 for the purpose of developing a sanctuary vision. **(MOTION)** Motion seconded by Barry Gibson.

Discussion: The possible methods for creating the sanctuary vision was discussed by SAC members William Adler, John Williamson, Peter Auster, Priscilla Brooks, Susan Farady, Barry Gibson, Deb Cramer, Dale Brown, SBNMS Superintendent Craig MacDonald and SBNMS Staff Ben Cowie-Haskell and Nathalie Ward.

According to the CD Action Plan, the sanctuary superintendent would draft the vision using SAC input. SAC members discussed how the SAC should provide the input to help the Superintendent draft the sanctuary vision. Members agreed that each member/alternate should provide information to sanctuary staff for the purpose of creating a draft vision statement that could be refined during the special meeting of the SAC in July. It was important that each member create a vision that was no longer than a paragraph and deliver it to sanctuary staff for synthesis. This would provide a way for each SAC member's constituents to have input through their representatives. The vision, as developed by each SAC member, must be guided by the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and by the wording used in the CD Action Plan.

The SAC was polled to determine what date would work best for the half day SAC meeting. SAC members determined that, based on member availability, 16th SAC meeting would be held 11 July 2005. For the meeting, the following action items have been assigned:

- Sanctuary staff to develop prep sheet for the visioning task, which will include language that constrains what the vision should contain, possible models to review and to be used as examples, and the framework of the visioning task—to be emailed to SAC membership by June 16, 2005.
- All SAC members, based on the above prep sheet, will each develop a sanctuary vision based on their constituent input that will be no longer than one paragraph—to be delivered to Nathalie Ward by June 30, 2005.
- Using the submitted visioning statements, sanctuary staff will synthesize and develop a draft sanctuary vision to be discussed at the July 11, 2005 SAC meeting—the synthesis to be emailed to SAC members by July 7, 2005.

The vision will be discussed and further refined at the 11 July 2005 SAC meeting. The vision will then be included in the draft Management Plan, and released for comment in Fall 2005.

(MOTION) This motion was carried with the following voting results (see Appendix A for voting record):

- Yea: 13
- Nay: 0
- Abstain: 0

State of the Sanctuary Report

Peter Auster expressed that the “State of the Sanctuary Report” was not really reporting on the state of the sanctuary. This pattern is repeated for all sanctuaries and not just the SBNMS report. He continued that many data venues currently exist that can be used to report on the status of each sanctuary. It is important for the report, or some other publication to report, on progress for each sanctuary. Metrics need to be identified to measure change in each sanctuary and report on status and change. There needs to be a venue for determining if changes within the sanctuary can be addressed, or if changes are caused by influences from outside the sanctuary boundary.

MacDonald explained that the “State of the Sanctuary Report,” as it exists now, has an institutionalized format. The report exists now as a communications model. The sanctuary agrees that the report does not serve as a status report. The NMSP has contracted with Clancy Environmental to identify possible metrics to be used for all sanctuaries to report on status. This project is currently using SBNMS as an example. This project is a prototype; the NMSP is working towards addressing the need to report on sanctuary status.

SAC Meeting Schedule

Ward proposed to schedule the next two SAC meetings—the week of October 10 and the week of December 5, 2005. Some members suggested that November may be a preferable month. Polling for dates of the next SAC meetings will be conducted through email correspondence.

VIII. Public Comment

No public comment was given.

IX. 15th SAC Meeting Adjourned

The 15th SAC Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM

SUMMARY of MOTIONS

9 June 2005

- *MOTION to accept the 14th SAC Minutes.*
- *MOTION to give the Executive Committee the authority to serve as the Selection Committee for new SAC membership.*
- *MOTION to accept the recommendations of the CD WG as amended by the SAC.*
- *MOTION to hold a special half day meeting of the SAC in July, 2005 for the purpose of developing a sanctuary vision.*

APPENDIX A

SAC Voting Record, 9 June 2005

**SBNMS SAC Action Plan Review
Voting Sheet**

MOTION to give the Executive Committee the authority to serve as the Selection Committee for new SAC membership.

Last	First	SAC Designation	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Adler	William	SAC Member	X		
Auster	Peter	SAC Member	X		
Barrett	Edward	SAC Member	X		
Borrelli	Peter	SAC Member	Absent		
Brooks	Priscilla	SAC Member	Absent in AM		
Brown	Dale	SAC Alternate	X		
Cramer	Deborah	SAC Member	X		
McCabe	Martin	SAC Alternate	X		
Farady	Susan	SAC Member			X
Gibson	Barry	SAC Member	X		
Milliken	Steve	SAC Member	X		
Hoagland	Porter	SAC Alternate	X		
Wheeler	Richard	SAC Member	X		
Williamson	John	SAC Member	X		

Totals: 11 0 1

**SBNMS SAC Action Plan Review
Voting Sheet**

MOTION to accept the recommendations of the CD WG as amended by the SAC.

Last	First	SAC Designation	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Adler	William	SAC Member	X		
Auster	Peter	SAC Member	X		
Barrett	Edward	SAC Member	X		
Borrelli	Peter	SAC Member	Absent		
Brooks	Priscilla	SAC Member	X		
Brown	Dale	SAC Alternate	X		
Cramer	Deborah	SAC Member	X		
McCabe	Martin	SAC Alternate	X		
Farady	Susan	SAC Member	X		
Gibson	Barry	SAC Member	X		
Milliken	Steve	SAC Member	X		
Hoagland	Porter	SAC Alternate	X		
Wheeler	Richard	SAC Member	X		
Williamson	John	SAC Member	X		
Totals:			13	0	0

**SBNMS SAC Action Plan Review
Voting Sheet**

MOTION to hold a special half day meeting of the SAC in July 2005 for the purpose of developing a sanctuary vision.

Last	First	SAC Designation	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Adler	William	SAC Member	X		
Auster	Peter	SAC Member	X		
Barrett	Edward	SAC Member	X		
Borrelli	Peter	SAC Member	Absent		
Brooks	Priscilla	SAC Member	X		
Brown	Dale	SAC Alternate	X		
Cramer	Deborah	SAC Member	X		
McCabe	Martin	SAC Alternate	X		
Farady	Susan	SAC Member	X		
Gibson	Barry	SAC Member	X		
Milliken	Steve	SAC Member	X		
Hoagland	Porter	SAC Alternate	X		
Wheeler	Richard	SAC Member	X		
Williamson	John	SAC Member	X		

Totals: 13 0 0